

Attorney Docket No. 740756-2691  
Application No. 10/743,337  
Page 13

### REMARKS

The Office Action of January 11, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. By this amendment, claims 2-4, 6, 9, 11, and 28-32 are amended to further define the invention, and claims 1 and 22 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 2-14, 17-20, and 23-52 are currently pending in the instant application.

On pages 2 to 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-14, 17-20, and 22-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, and 11 recite the variable "x" without any corresponding range limit. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 11 to recite, in part, "x is a natural number larger than or equal to 2." Applicants respectfully assert that support for this newly-claimed feature may be found at page 10, lines 1-6, wherein one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize that if monomers are cationic polymerized, then the reputation of the bracketed unit should become a natural number larger than or equal to 2. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the newly-claimed feature does not introduce new matter, and now renders claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 11 definite for particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention.

In addition, the Office Action alleges that recitation of the term "main" by claims 28-32 is not clear. Accordingly, without acquiescing to the allegation that the term, as used in the phrase recited by claims 28-32, is unclear, Applicants have amended claims 28-32 to remove the phrase "as its main component" to advance prosecution of the present application. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 28-32 are now definite for particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention.

Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that recitation of "the plurality of second electrodes" by claims 36, 41, and 46 lacks antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claim 9 to recite, in part, "a plurality" of second electrodes in order to provide antecedent basis for the features recited by claims 36, 41, and 46. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 36, 41, and 46 are now definite for particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention.

Attorney Docket No. 740756-2691

Application No. 10/743,337

Page 14

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

On pages 3 to 11 of the Office Action, claims 1-14, 17-20, and 22-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Townes et al. (WO 02/26859 A1) in view of various combinations with Grant & Hackh's Chemical Dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> Ed., Zhuang et al. (US 6,602,395), Kamatani et al. (US 2003/0059646), Wolk et al. (US 6,194,119), and Mori et al. (US 5,281,489). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 2, as amended, recites an electroluminescent element including, in part, a layer interposed between first and second electrodes "wherein the layer comprises an ammonium perchlorate and a polymer having the following general formula (I) as a repeating unit," (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 4, as amended, recites a light-emitting device including, in part, a first layer interposed between first and second electrodes "wherein the first layer comprises an ammonium perchlorate and a first polymer having the following general formula (I) as a repeating unit," (emphasis added). Likewise, independent claim 6, as amended, recites a light-emitting device including, in part, a plurality of layers each formed between a corresponding one of the plurality of first electrodes and a corresponding one of the plurality of second electrodes, "wherein at least one of the plurality of layers comprises an ammonium perchlorate and a first polymer having the following general formula (I) as a repeating unit," (emphasis added). Moreover, independent claim 9, as amended, recites a light-emitting device including, in part, a plurality of layers each formed between a corresponding one of the plurality of first electrodes and the second electrode, "wherein at least one of the plurality of layers comprises an ammonium perchlorate and a first polymer having the following general formula (I) as a repeating unit," (emphasis added). Finally, independent claim 11, as amended, recites a light-emitting device including, in part, "wherein each of the first layer, the second layer and the third layer further comprises an ammonium perchlorate," (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that support for this newly-claimed feature may be found on page 20, lines 1-5. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would know that claimed "layer" would comprise ammonium perchlorate since ammonium perchlorate is used as a supporting electrolyte for electrolytic polymerizing the

Attorney Docket No. 740756-2691

Application No. 10/743,337

Page 15

Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is introduced by the above amendments to independent claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 11.

In direct contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, neither Townes et al. nor Grant & Hackh's Chemical Dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. teach or suggest an electroluminescent element or light emitting device including the structures recited by at least independent claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 11. Specifically, none of Townes et al., Grant & Hackh's Chemical Dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> Ed., Zhuang et al., Kamatani et al., Wolk et al., and/or Mori et al., whether taken singly or in any combination, teach or suggest a layer or layers comprising an ammonium perchlorate and a polymer having the general formula shown in independent claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Townes et al., Grant & Hackh's Chemical Dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> Ed., Zhuang et al., Kamatani et al., Wolk et al., and/or Mori et al., whether taken singly or in any combination, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claims 2, 4, 6, 9, and 11, and hence dependent claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, 17-20, and 23-52.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Townes et al., Grant & Hackh's Chemical Dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> Ed., Zhuang et al., Kamatani et al., Wolk et al., and/or Mori et al. be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the prior art rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that all pending claims be indicated as allowable, and that the application be passed to issue.

If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,  
NIXON PEABODY LLP

 35,493  
David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47,362

David B. Hardy

Registration No. 47,362

Date: April 11, 2008

CUSTOMER NO. 22204  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128